1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
3			
4 5	UNITED STATES OF AMI		06-CR-6007(CJS)
6 7 8		dant. X	Rochester, New York January 12, 216 4:17 p.m.
9			
LO	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARIAN W. PAYSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
L1			
L2		WILLIAM J. HOCHUL,	1.5
L3 L4	United States Attorney BY: RICHARD RESNICK, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorney		
L5		6200 Federal Buildi Rochester, New York	ing
L6 L7 L8		MICHAEL D. FLOWERDA 277 Pond View Heigh Rochester, New York Appearing on behalf	nts x 14612
L9 20		Ivette Hernandez, l Catherine A. Marr	J.S. Probation Office
21	AODIO RECORDER:	catherine A. Mari	
22	]	Christi A. Macri, F Kenneth B. Keating	Federal Building
23 24		100 State Street, F Rochester, New York	
25	(Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by computer).		

PROCEEDINGS

\* \* \*

3 (WHEREUPON, the defendant is present).

THE CLERK: United States of America vs. Richard
Petix, 06-CR-6007.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE PAYSON: All right, good afternoon. I understand Mr. Petix appeared before Judge Siragusa this morning and Judge Siragusa set a date in early to mid February for a further status conference?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Your Honor.

magistrate judge payson: All right. So the record should reflect that because Judge Siragusa was out of the district during the holiday period of time, the matter was referred to me for the purpose of holding a hearing on the Government's motion for detention in this case, that is, the case of the petition alleging that Mr. Petix has violated conditions of his probation.

There's a separate matter pending before Judge Scott in Buffalo relating to new charges. That was not the matter before me.

The parties agreed with my assessment at the hearing that the proceedings are governed by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.1(a)(6), that is, that because this deals with the issue of release or detention for somebody who has been convicted and is under supervision, that it is the

defendant's burden rather than the Government's burden in this
case to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the
individual not flee or pose a danger to any other person or

the community.

Mr. Petix.

At the hearing I heard testimony that was offered by Mr. Petix from Mr. Petix's father. That testimony related to a number of subjects, but I would say principally addressed the issue of financial security that could be posted for

Mr. Petix, Louis Petix, the defendant's father, indicated a willingness to post a condominium as well as perhaps another property, as I understand it, owned by the defendant's grandmother, although there was some uncertainty as to whether that -- the grandmother was willing to do that.

The Government cross-examined Mr. Petix and then made a proffer with respect to facts and evidence and circumstances that the Government thought the Court should consider in weighing the Government's motion for detention.

I have considered that testimony and those proffers. I have reviewed the docket sheets. I have gone back and listened to a tape recording of the entire proceeding. The proceeding took about an hour, it was about the last thing that I was able to do before I had to be out of town so I wanted to make sure that I took the time to listen to it carefully again, and I have done that.

Significantly in my mind, Mr. Petix is before the Court as a convicted defendant, specifically one who was convicted of knowing transportation of child pornography in interstate commerce.

The plea agreement pursuant to which Mr. Petix pled guilty in that case states that the parties are agreeing that the child pornography was transported by computer.

The plea agreement further states in the section in which the parties agree to the factual circumstances relating to the offense that there were over 1,000 images of child pornography on the defendant's computer and the discussion of trading child pornography.

Since then he has been indicted in the matter pending before Judge Scott for lying to Probation concerning his use of computers, devices capable of being connected to the internet. And that indictment obviously constitutes a finding by the grand jury that there is probable cause to believe that he did lie to Probation in that respect.

The Government proffered various factual circumstances relating to Mr. Petix's arrest on December 3rd, 2015. The Court doesn't find any reason not to credit those proffered circumstances at this stage.

Perhaps evidence will develop that will call them into question, but at this juncture what the Government has proffered is that various members of the Probation Department,

- 1 | including Officer Hernandez, who is Mr. Petix's probation
- 2 officer, were involved in his arrest on December 3rd at a
- 3 restaurant.
- And at the time of the arrest Mr. Petix was
- 5 actively involved in using a computer, was in a program on
- 6 | that computer; that there was a thumb drive inserted into that
- 7 | computer; that there was a smart phone that was in his
- 8 possession, specifically open on the table next to the
- 9 computer.
- 10 According to the circumstances proffered by the
- 11 | Government, Mr. Petix's girlfriend said the items were --
- 12 belonged to Mr. Petix.
- And in addition, the Government has proffered that
- 14 there was a bag in the car that Mr. Petix was driving that has
- 15 been identified as Mr. Petix's bag, which had four more thumb
- 16 drives in it.
- 17 There was some evidence that was proffered with
- 18 respect to some text messages on the phone. Some
- 19 conversations about Mr. Petix's possible involvement in
- 20 | bitcoin buying, trading transactions; some allegations made by
- 21 | the Government concerning Mr. Petix's possible involvement in
- 22 unlawful dealing or distribution of Adderall.
- I am not basing my decision on my view that the
- 24 record before me is sufficient to establish that Mr. Petix was
- 25 | most probably involved in illegal activities over his phone.

I am not -- I don't think the record is sufficient for me to reach that conclusion.

2.2

However, it is my view that when somebody is on supervision for an offense of child pornography and interstate commerce involving a computer, that the condition which is a fairly typical condition which requires him to identify any computers, connective devices, automated services, so forth that he has, that he has access to, that he plans to use, that he must identify them to Probation so that Probation can fit those devices with monitoring software, that that is a very, very critical condition to assure that the defendant, who is on supervision, is refraining from unlawful activity, particularly child pornography.

Here there is proffered evidence which the Court credits that at the time of the arrest Mr. Petix was in possession of such devices and actively using a computer with a thumb drive in it.

I know the defense's proffer at this juncture is they're not his. The Government's proffer is that the probation officers, including Officer Hernandez who is in court, actually observe the defendant doing that.

So to the extent that I need to credit one over the other at this juncture, I am inclined to credit the Government's proffer that Mr. Petix was arrested in possession of these devices and most significantly using a computer at

1 the time of his arrest.

Furthermore, the grand jury has concluded that there's probable cause to believe that he lied about the fact that he was using these devices. And the conclusion to be drawn from that, in my estimation, is that there is certainly substantial doubt as to whether Mr. Petix can be trusted to comply with conditions when the grand jury has found that he lied about those conditions.

Whether I would draw a different conclusion if all of those devices had been thoroughly searched and the Government were here telling me that there was nothing evidencing any illegal transactions and specifically any child pornography related items on the devices, I don't know. I'm not in that circumstance.

What I was told by the Government when I asked about the review of those materials was that only the phone had been able to be reviewed because the other devices were password protected. That Mr. Petix had declined to provide his password.

His probation conditions do obligate him to cooperate in the search of any such devices. I'm not sure the Government can compel him to do that certainly where there may be a Fifth Amendment interest.

But, in any event, as far as I am aware as of December 23rd, and I don't think there's any reason to think

that this has changed since then, the computer hadn't been searched, the thumb drives had not been searched. So I am not in a position to find that his activities on those devices

4 were lawful activities.

He does bear the burden of establishing that by clear and convincing evidence that continued release would not pose a danger to the community or that he doesn't pose a serious risk of flight, and I do not find that he has met that burden under the circumstances that have been proffered and that I credit.

I will say that if the issue were risk of flight alone, Mr. Petix had a case pending before me, I think there was a violation that was filed, a pretrial release violation that was filed in that case and I modified the conditions -- I dealt with that without detaining Mr. Petix.

And as far as I know, there were no further violations, at least that I can -- that I can recall. And he came to court.

So I think that with the properties that

Mr. Petix's father has described, assuming that there were
sufficient equity in those properties, assuming the
grandmother was willing to post the properties, I believe that
I would find that there are conditions that could be set which
would reasonably assure against a serious risk of flight and
that the defendant would be able to establish that by clear

and convincing evidence. 1 2 There would be some homework we would need to do with respect to those properties, but I want to be clear that 3 4 I am detaining Mr. Petix on grounds of danger to the community, not on the grounds of serious risk of flight. 5 All right, thank you. 6 (WHEREUPON, the proceedings adjourned at 4:29 p.m.) 7 8 9 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 10 11 In accordance with 28, U.S.C., 753(b), I certify that 12 this is a true and correct record of proceedings from the 13 official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the 14 United States District Court for the Western District of New 15 York before the Honorable Marian W. Payson on January 12, 16 2016. 17 S/ Christi A. Macri 18 19 Christi A. Macri, FAPR-CRR Official Court Reporter 20 2.1 22 23 24 25